

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated August, 18, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 39-45 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failure to produce a tangible result. The Examiner also rejected Claims 39-45 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,963,642 to Benjamin D. Goldstein ("Goldstein") in view of U.S. Patent Number U.S. 5,710,917 ("Musa").

I. The Present Invention Does Produce a Tangible Result

The Examiner rejected the Application under 35 U.S.C. §101 claiming that the present invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Respectfully, the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion.

Pending Claim 39 produces a tangible result, which is a preferred representation of an address (see Paragraph 0049). This tangible result is produced by utilizing the enhancement module, which is configured to transform one or more of said tables into a sparse matrix linked list; a publication and subscription module for controlling the distribution of data in a server-client network environment; a matching and validation module for converting a subjective representation of an address into the preferred representation of the address, and utilization of an interface for controlling access to a superset by external applications.

Considering further, for example, the "matching and validation module," this module "convert[s] a subjective representation of an address into a preferred representation of said address." As disclosed in the specification (Section 5.3, pages 32-35) addresses may be converted from a subjective representation (e.g., one commonly used by humans) into a standard format. This is not the mere copying of data, but involves application of rules for converting, or transforming data.

The transformation of data does represent patentable subject matter. Specifically, in *State Street Band & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group Inc.*, 149 F.3d 1368, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 1998) the courts recognized that "transformation of data, representing discrete dollar amounts, by a machine through a series of mathematical calculations into a final share price, constitutes a practical application of a mathematical algorithm, formula, or calculation, because it produces a 'useful, concrete and tangible result'..." Similarly, the

transformation of data from a subjective address representation by algorithm to a preferred address representation represents a "tangible" result as well. Consequently, the claim does recite transformation and does provide a useful, concrete and tangible result. The claim does not merely recite an abstract idea, but the transformation of data based on certain rules.

As the transformation of data via an algorithm is within patentable subject matter, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §101.

II. The Present Invention Is Patentable Over the Prior Art, Musa and Goldstein

The present invention is distinct from the invention in Musa because of, at least, the lack of the disclosure of converting a subjective address format to a preferred address format. The preferred representation is the tangible result that occurs after the present invention converts the subjective representation of an address, which may involve a database management system 110.

Musa does not disclose such a conversion, but rather, a simple copying and pasting action ("mapping"), as can be seen from Figure 6, and the discussion thereof. In the Field of the Invention of Musa, Col. 1, Line 7-10, the Patent states "This invention relates to a computer application system for automatically deriving data mappings, and more particularly, to a design tool that *assists in the efficient migration of data from one storage format to another.*" (emphasis added) Thus, the purpose of Musa is completely different from the present invention, in that data is copied from one location from another via the method provided for in Musa. In most cases, the data is not altered, but may be stored or linked differently. In other cases, data may be linked to an alias, but this is not the same as substituting certain data in a first record based on certain rules to produce a second record.

In Goldstein, data is stored in tables, as shown in figures 1A and 1B, but maintained in an encrypted form. For example, In Goldstein, the BPM (Binary Property Matrix) is the fundamental data structure central to SPARCOM (Sparse Associative Relational Connection Matrix), which is central to the idea of Goldstein (see Col. 5, line 10-15, and Col. 4, lines 45, 64. This essentially allows for information to be stored in a

database system for quick retrieval with short response times. This type of system is convenient for encryption and decryption of data. While the information in Goldstein is locally decrypted in certain circumstances, the simple encryption process does not render the Goldstein system an innovation in the art over the present invention.

The present invention involves a more complex system involving a matching and validation module for address data, which converts data into a preferred representation from a subjective representation. For example, consider the illustration provided in the specification at pages 33 and 34. The following address may be written in the subjective form by a human:

John Doe
123 East Main Street, N.W.
Oakland Center, Suite A-4
Atlanta, Georgia 30030

The same address, when converted into the preferred representation, may be:

JOHN DOE
123 E MAIN ST NW STE A4
DECATUR GA 30030-1549

Note that the conversion cannot be equated to the encryption process disclosed in Goldstein. Encryption and its reverse process, decryption, are designed to result in the same exact information. Thus, "Information A" when encrypted and then decrypted produces "Information A" exactly. There is no change in the data. Obviously, the process of converting subjective addresses to a preferred form is not the same as encryption as disclosed in Goldstein, because information is transformed.

Nor is the converting process disclosed by Musa. In Musa, data in a database is linked from one format to another (e.g., the "mapping process"). This is changing how data is related or represented syntactically, not the data itself. Musa does disclose potentially altering the syntax (e.g., data structure representation), but not the semantics. For example, Musa discloses it may be possible for converting the syntax of a data element (e.g., copying a five digit zip code to a nine-digit zip code, see col. 5, lines 49-

60). However, Musa does not disclose using the five digit zip code and other address information to ascertain what the new four digits should be for the new zip code.

The difference is significant. For example, it is well known that database programs can alter the size of a particular field in the records in the database. Thus, if a database record has a 5 digit zip code, increasing this to 9 digit field can be done. This involves creating a 9 digit field, copying the contents of the 5 digit field, and then deleting the 5 digit field. Further, the zip code field can be defined to appear in a different record, or different related database. This "mapping" of data is what Musa discloses (e.g., the "*migration of data from one storage format to another*"). However, merely copying the 5 digit zip code to a 9 digit field does not indicate what is the value of the new digits. Presumably, they are defaulted to a null value. A program for merely linking the data would not know how to define the additional zip code digits. However, there is a significant distinction between simply copying the 5 digit zip code into a 9 digit field, versus copy the 5 digit zip code and ascertaining the proper additional new 4 digit zip code digits. Ascertaining the additional 4 digits requires processing other information, such as the street address and the application of other rules. There is no such analogous disclosure in Musa. At most, Musa discloses or suggests copying data in a field having a first structure to another field having a second structure, or reordering the data in a record. There is no disclosure of transforming the data above and beyond what is being copied.

The transformation of addresses from a subjective form to a preferred or standard form is accomplished by the application of "standardization" rules. Thus, for example, the rules may result in an address for "Atlanta" being replaced with "Decatur" based on the street address and zip code location. This is not disclosed by Musa either. The "alias" capability of Musa (see, e.g., col. 9) is not analogous. First, Musa discloses in Table 2 data aliases associated with a given data field. It does not indicate what rules are to be used for replacing a field in a record or under what circumstances a particular alias is to be used. Presumably, that is the function of the person designing the mapping scheme.

In the context of converting address information, it is incorrect to simply substitute "Decatur" as an alias for "Atlanta" or vice versa. Doing so would be in error,

since in the vast majority of instances, replacing "Atlanta" with "Decatur" would be incorrect.

For example, consider the following:

John Doe
45 Atlanta St.
Marietta, GA 30006

It would be incorrect to simply rewrite this as:

John Doe
45 Decatur St.
Marietta, GA 30006

Furthermore, it is incorrect to rewrite:

Alston & Bird
1201 W. Peachtree St.
Atlanta, GA 30309

as:

Alston & Bird
1201 W. Peachtree St.
Decatur, GA 30309

In short, merely identifying "Decatur" as an alias for "Atlanta" is not proper, useful, or germane to converting a subjective address to a preferred address. While Musa discloses alias information for a data field, Musa does not disclose the limitation of "converting a subjective representation of an address into a preferred representation of said address."

The determination how to convert an address is made via rules based on other data within the record, including, e.g., address and zip code. Musa, again, does not disclose the use of such rules to determine how the data is changed, but merely discloses a mapping from one data element to others may occur. It does not even indicate which of the alias to use.

The Applicant will now address each claim individually to distinguish the prior art from the present invention.

A. Claim 39

Claim 39 is a system claim that claims the address management system, including the superset, enhancement module, publication and subscription module, matching and validation module, and the superset interface of the present invention.

The Examiner states that the Goldstein reference, in Fig. 5, 6A-6B, discloses the present invention, including the address management system comprising a superset comprising a primary database operatively connected to one or more secondary databases, each of said databases comprising a plurality of linked tables, and each of said tables sharing a common data structure. The Examiner further states:

- the “primary database” of the present invention corresponds to the “database” in the database server 30 in Fig. 5 of Goldstein.
- “One or more secondary databases” are disclosed in Col. 13, lines 8-11, wherein Goldstein discloses that one or more database server are attached as shown in Fig. 6B of Goldstein.
- “Each of said databases comprising a plurality of linked tables”, wherein, since the database in Goldstein is a RDBMS, therefore, the database must include plurality of linked tables. (See col. 20, lines 20-44 of Goldstein).
- “An enhancement module configured to transform one or more of said tables into a sparse matrix list” corresponds to the module that is implemented in the database to produce the sparse matrix linked list (see col. 9, lines 10-28 of Goldstein).
- “A publication and subscription module for controlling the distribution of data in a server-client network environment” corresponds to the communication port in Fig. 5, col. 15, and lines 21-25 of Goldstein. The “publication and subscription module” also corresponds to the “trusted key server” that can be used to distribute information in Fig. 10, col. 23, lines 38-54 of Goldstein.
- “And an interface for controlling access to said superset by one or more external applications” See Fig. 5 of Goldstein, wherein the interface corresponds to the input port 2 in the end user workstation.

Admittedly, the Examiner notes that Goldstein does not disclose the matching and validation module, which is a component of the present invention (see page 5 of the Office Action, Claim 39, and Paragraphs [0140]-[0256]). The discussion of the matching and validation module begins at Paragraph 0081 of the Application. The Examiner looks to Musa for disclosure of this limitation, which the Examiner states is found in the method for deriving data mappings and data aliases, for which the Examiner cites the "title of Musa" as part of the basis for the argument, see page 5, for comprising a method for transforming data from one format of a database to another format to another database.

The Applicant argues, however, that the "title of Musa", which is "Method for Deriving Data Mappings and Aliases" *supports the Applicant's argument*- Musa is a method of simply mapping data, where the present invention does more than simply map data. As show above, merely mapping data will not result in producing a preferred address. In one embodiment, the present invention may includes a matching a validation module, which is not simply a method of mapping data from one date field location to another.

The Examiner further cites Figure 7, col. 7, lines 57-col 8, lines 5 of Musa. All this illustrates is the mapping of data "from one format of a database to another format [of] another database" (Office Action, page 5). The mapping of data is the mere copying of the information without altering its intrinsic meaning into a different syntax.

The Examiner states that the data can be the address data in Col 5, lines 55-58 of Musa, and therefore, Musa discloses a module that can convert a "subjective representation of an address" into a "preferred representation of an address." The representation of an address in a preferred or standardized format requires the application of standardized rules – it is not the mere reformatting of data (e.g., changing the order or fields in a mechanical manner, or expanding the maximum size of a field). As discussed above above, ascertaining when "Atlanta" is to be replaced with "Decatur" is not merely mapping data from one field to another.

Applicant argues converting a subjective address form to a preferred address form is more complicated than simply the mapping of data disclosed in Musa. This involves the application of additional rules, as discussed above, which are not disclosed by Musa.

Further regarding claim 39, the Examiner further cites that Goldstein discloses a "method for secure storage of data for the [user] to access the data and suggests that "modified [sic] can be made without departing from the scope of the invention" (see page 5 of Examiner's Office Action citing Col. 27, lines 17-22 of Goldstein). Applicant disagrees with this conclusion of the Examiner, as the overall purpose of Goldstein is to store encrypted data (see Field of the Invention, Goldstein, Col. 1, line 5), not to perform the functions recited in claim 39 of the present invention, which includes those performed by the matching and validation module.

In the Examiner's conclusion, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Musa to the invention of Goldstein because both Goldstein and Musa are in the same field of endeavor, and the combination would provide the user with the ability to retrieve more data using the mapping disclosed by Musa.

Applicant submits that the prior art references are not in the same field of endeavor. Goldstein is "related to the secure storage of data." More specifically, it concerns the "storage of semantically encrypted data without requiring decryption of data. (Goldstein, col. 1, lines 1-5). Musa pertains to a "design tool that assists in the efficient migration of data from one storage format to another." (Musa, col. 1, lines 7-9). Goldstein pertains to secure data storage and retrieval by users, while Musa pertains to data migration, e.g., a database administrator function. While both pertain to a database, they pertain to different aspects and attempt to solve different problems.

Further, Applicant submits that the combination of the references is inapplicable as cited by the Examiner. First, Musa pertains to database administration. During such events, users are precluded from updating the database, or even accessing the database. The existence of an "old file" and a "new file" is a transient condition. Typically, when completed, the "old file" is not longer accessed or erased. In contrast, Goldstein discloses multiple databases that may be accessed by users during normal operation. This represents a different situation than when databases are being updated. One skilled in the art would not combine the operation of Goldstein simultaneously with the updating taught in Musa – they are incompatible.

Finally, Applicant does not understand the motivation allegedly found in Goldstein regarding "the ability to retrieve more data using the mapping disclosed by Musa." Goldstein does not state that retrieving more data is a problem that is solved, nor why this is advantageous.

Section 2142 of the MPEP states that "[t]he initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. 'To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.' " Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 972 (Bd. Of Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). Applicant submits that neither reference expressly or impliedly suggests the claimed invention, nor is "the ability to retrieve more data using the mapping disclosed by Musa" an apparent reason why the combinations of the teachings is proper.

Although Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for claim 39, the same logic holds for the remainder of the claims.

B. Claim 40

Claim 40 depends on Claim 39, and recites additional limitations regarding the enhancement module. As per Claim 40, the Examiner argues that the combination of Goldstein and Musa disclose "wherein the enhancement module is further configured to arrange the records of one or more of said tables in hierarchical order, in a series of levels from general to specific, based upon said data." The Office Action has referenced column 14, lines 24-28 of Goldstein, which references Figure 6B, which is a network architecture involving multiple database servers.

The network shown in Figure 6B cannot be considered to render obvious the enhancement module of Claim 40, which arranges records of the address management system in hierarchical order, from general to specific, in a series of levels, based on data. Figure 6B by itself in Goldstein discloses various end user terminals that are connected to two databases. It is unclear how Fig. 6b by itself discloses "tables in hierarchical order."

The text referenced in column 14, lines 24-28 discusses the properties of 'codebooks.' The "codebooks" are discussed earlier in Goldstein, which states:

...the database information residing on any given end-user client workstation is a codebook consisting of a list of pairs of values. One member of each pair specifies a property; the other value specifies a set of q-code equivalents for the given property. The codebooks can therefore be seen to provide an index of the properties that a given end-user client workstation has cryptographic keys for." (Col. 13, lines 12-19.)

Any discussion of "codebooks," which reside on end-user client workstations appears irrelevant to the limitation of claim 40, which discloses the arrangement of records of the tables in the database. Further, the "codebooks" have information about the database schema information and which cryptographic keys a client workstation has, which does not disclose that the "enhancement module is further configured to arrange the records" in any particular hierarchical order. The text in column 14 of Goldstein appears to be a hierarchical naming arrangement for identifying one of several databases referenced in the codebook, and does not indicate the structure of the records with a particular database itself.

The text cited in Goldstein does not appear to be related to the limitations at hand (e.g., the database and client workstation are fundamentally different). The text in Goldstein does not disclose limitations pertaining to a record structure within a database. Thus, the references do not render Claim 40 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and the Applicant argues that Claim 40 is patentable over the combination of Goldstein and Musa.

C. Claim 41

Claim 41 depends from Claim 39, and describes the primary, first secondary, second secondary, and third secondary databases. The Examiner states that the combination of Goldstein and Musa discloses:

Wherein: said primary database includes source tables, a first secondary database includes alias tables, a second secondary database includes standardization tables, and a third secondary database is configured to accept and store input data." 'Musa discloses a method to convert data from one format of a storage to another format of another storage (Col. 7, lines 57-58 of Musa) using the alias table data (col. 9, lines 7-9 of Musa). As in combination with Goldstein invention, the

combination would produce....a primary database....a first secondary database (since Goldstein suggest that multiple databases can be included at Col. 13, lines 10-11) includes alias tables (using Musa alias table, in claim 7-8).... [and] a standardization tables corresponds to the second format of the data after using the mapping to transform (using the Musa invention).

-Page 6, Examiners Office Action.

Respectfully, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion. Applicant submits that this alleged combination of references to illustrate the claim limitations illustrates why the combination of Musa and Goldstein is inappropriate.

First, Musa pertains to updating data from one database to another (col. 5t, lines 48-50.). Although not explicitly stated, this occurs by database system administrators who must update or adapt a database to changes in requirements, corporate restructuring, or technology changes (see, generally col. 5). Thus, Musa pertains to a temporary condition associated with database administration, which is not representative of normal use. During such a change, users of the database would be limited in their access. For example, during updating a database, users would like be denied access (it is well known that such updates are typically done at late night hours). Alternatively, users would be able to only read a copy of the original database. *Users would not be able to access both the original and the updated database during the process of migrating the data.*

In contrast, Goldstein discloses users accessing multiple databases during normal operation (see, e.g., Fig. 6B).

The combination of the two, as required in order to render claim 41 obvious cannot occur. One cannot have databases that are being updating as disclosed in Musa at the same time that users are normally accessing the databases as disclosed in Goldstein.

The Examiner refers to col. 13, lines 10-11 for support of the disclosure of multiple databases. These lines refer to the "codebook", which was previously discussed. The "codebook" is database scheme information and cryptographic key information residing on a client workstation. It is not clear how this allegedly supports the disclosure of multiple databases with the limitations as recited in claim 41.

D. Claim 42

Claim 42 depends from Claim 41, and defines the sources tables, the alias tables, and the standardization tables. The Examiner states that Claim 42 is taught by the combination of Goldstein and Musa, wherein:

said source tables comprise data records obtained from a public or private source (See Col. 5, lines 49-67 of Musa where the data can be from federal or state [sic] (corresponds to public source)), said alias tables comprise one or more equivalent representations of a record (col. 9, lines 7-9 of Musa) and said standardization tables comprise one or more standardization representations of a record.

Since the nine digits zip code corresponds to standardization data (Musa), therefore, the table that contains the nine digits zip code corresponds to the standardization table.

The Applicant disagrees that the sources tables, alias tables, and the standardization tables of the present invention are taught by the cited references. The Examiner points to Col. 5, lines 49-67 of Musa, which states:

It often becomes necessary to move data from one database to another or to one set of files within a single database to a different set of files. Such changes can be necessitated in several common circumstances. For example, a corporation might restructure its internal organization in such a way that employees are no longer classified by organization, division, department, or section, but only by using the organization, division, or department categories. Another similar situation would be when changes in the U.S. Postal Service classification system might require that five digit zip codes be converted to nine digit zip codes. Further, growth in the size of the organization may require that the field width of the employee identification number be increased in size.

Yet another example might be changes in federal, state, and local tax regimes requiring that state and local taxes be withheld where only federal taxes had earlier been withheld. Changes in technology might require that the employee directory also contain the facsimile and beeper numbers of employees. In yet a different circumstance, some systems within an applications suite may store the same data as other systems but the data stored within the two systems may not be identical because of failure to update one of the databases.

Applicant argues that the cited portions of Musa do not render the claimed matter obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner has cited a description of reasoning of why data may need to be relocated from one location to another location. As explained

previously, "converting" an address from a subjection form to a preferred form is not simply "relocating" data. Nor does the cited section disclose what tables are required to relocate the data. Claim 42 involves three (3) sets of tables, which comprise different sets of records that are utilized in the address management system. The source tables are records from public or private sources, the alias tables are one or more equivalent representations of a record, and the standardization tables are one or more standardized representations of a record. Because the Office Action has not shown how Musa discloses the recited limitations, Applicant submits that claim 42 is patentable over Musa, or Musa in combination Goldstein.

E. Claim 43

Claim 43 depends from Claim 42, and further provides the limitation that the sources tables must comprise address tables obtained from a government postal service and a commercial source. Claim 43 states, "The system of Claim 42 wherein said source tables comprise address records obtained from a government postal service and commercial source."

The Examiner states that as per Claim 42, the combination of Goldstein and Musa discloses "wherein the source tables comprise address records obtained from a government postal service and a commercial source" and cites Col 5, lines 55-58 of Musa. Respectfully, the Applicant disagrees, and states that the combination of Goldstein and Musa does not render the present invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The cited portion of Musa by the Examiner states, "Another similar situation would be when changes in the U.S. Postal Service classification might require that five digit zip codes be converted to nine digit zip codes." It doesn't appear to the Applicant that the cited statement by the Examiner renders Claim 43 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). For example, simply having a table of 9 digits zip codes would not indicate how a 5 digit zip code is to be mapped. Doing so requires additional rules and processing for

ascertaining where a particular address within a 5 digit zip code would be mapped to a 9 digits zip code. There is no disclosure of any such procedure in Musa, and the referenced sections do not disclose where the address records are obtained from. Therefore, the Applicant argues that this Claim is patentable over the combination over the prior art.

F. Claim 44

Claim 44 depends from Claim 40, and provides definitions for a first table, a second table, and a third table. The Examiner states that Claim 44 is rendered obvious by Col 9, table 2, lines 15-25 of Musa, which, according to the Office Action, teaches:

a first table includes preferred records, a second table includes primary alias records, and a third table includes primary alias records" and "wherein: said preferred records comprise one or more preferred representations, said primary alias records comprise one more preferred representations, said primary alias records comprise one or more equivalent representations of a primary address artifact, and said secondary alias records comprising one or more equivalent representations of a secondary address artifact.

First, Applicant notes that Table 2 in Musa does not disclose any records at all. The table only shows alias for data fields. It is well known that data fields in a record are not the same as the record itself. Thus, Table 2 is insufficient to disclose any records at all.

The Examiner argues that the preferred records correspond to the nine digit zip code data in the Musa reference. Respectfully, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion. First, it is unclear how "records" can be equated with a single field comprising a nine digit zip code. This attempts to equate a table comprising records with a table comprising fields. They are not the same concept. A records comprise various data fields. A table of fields, by itself, indicates nothing about a record. For example, an subjective address record may have a name, street address, street, city, and state information. Alternatively, a subjective address record may have, instead of a street address, a post office box. A table of data aliases (e.g., "Decatur" is an alias for "Atlanta") has no relationship or bearing on the record structure, much less the limitations in claim 44.

G. Claim 45

Claim 45 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 44, which further defines the preferred records as preferred representations, the primary alias records as the one or more equivalent representations of a primary address artifact, and the secondary alias record as an equivalent representation of a secondary address artifact.

The Examiner makes the same argument for Claim 45 as for Claim 44. In addition to the arguments made for Claim 44, the Applicant would like to reiterate that, instead of mapping data as is performed in the Musa reference, the present invention is transforming data from subjective representations into preferred representations. The Musa reference involves mapping data in a field from a first location to a second location, and as such, does not require the records claimed in Claim 45 to accomplish the purpose. Further, the disclosure of Table 2 in Musa, discloses at most, data aliases for fields in a record, not for the record itself.

RECEIVED 28/028 F-121
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 20 2006

CONCLUSION


In view of the remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims of the application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Karl H. Koster
Registration No. 50,684

Customer No. 00826 ALSTON & BIRD LLP Bank of America Plaza 101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000 Charlotte, NC 28280-4000 Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000 Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777	CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office at Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on the date shown below.  Date <u>11/20/06</u>
--	---